

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9391

Department appropriation bill, which I understand probably will be called up tomorrow.

The first amendment would eliminate \$280 million for a proposed new conventionally powered *Forrestal* class aircraft carrier.

The second amendment would reduce from \$320 million to \$171 million, for the fiscal year 1963—the amount requested by the administration—the appropriation of funds for the B-70 manned-bomber program.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, regarding the B-70 and its recent cousin, the RS-70, the \$171 million requested by the Department of Defense and requested in the President's budget is adequate to continue development. More than \$1 billion has already been made available for the B-70.

It is my hope that the Senate as a whole will endorse the judgment of the President and Secretary McNamara, based on rock-solid logical and factual analysis, by not appropriating funds above the budget request for the B-70.

The item for the aircraft carrier requested by the Navy is in the bill, as recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee, for \$280 million. But if past experience is any guide, it is unlikely that this ship can be built for less than \$340 million.

Yet one-third of a billion dollars is only a downpayment on an aircraft carrier. The cost of one aircraft carrier, with supply and refueling ships, anti-aircraft equipment, and airplanes, is over \$1 billion.

Almost as large as the U.S. Capitol—the length of three football fields—with a top speed of 30 knots, confined to the surface of the ocean, and with none of the advantages of hardened protection or underwater concealment, an aircraft carrier is an inviting target.

To buy a conventional carrier in an age of nuclear submarines, intercontinental rockets, supersonic airplanes, and sky-to-ground missiles is to invest in obsolescence. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the testimony of so many experts is that the only use of such a conventional aircraft carrier is for conventional war, and that in terms of conventional war it would be better to replace one of our present aircraft carriers rather than make this proposed addition to the carrier fleet.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT IS MIS-TAKEN IN OPPOSING THE FREE-DOM ACADEMY

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, several Senators have sponsored proposed legislation creating a Freedom Academy to provide research and expert training to Americans in and out of government in the nonmilitary aspects of the cold war.

I feel that this legislation is urgently necessary for many, many reasons. Of course, primarily we need it because our Russian adversaries in the cold war have

been successfully engaged in this paramilitary activity and have been winning because of it. In addition, in the absence of such competent and responsible training, a number of ill-informed, irresponsible extremist groups have developed around the country, with do-it-yourself Red-fighting programs, that in some cases may do more harm than good.

After patiently waiting for many months, we have finally received a report on the Freedom Academy from the State Department. The gist of the report is that we are doing enough already.

This smug position is flatly contradicted by the lack of any effective Government action to equip America to fight this crucial cold-war battle except for a pitifully inadequate indoctrination of a few hundred foreign service officers for a few days.

Obviously, the present program does not even scratch the surface. I earnestly hope that the Foreign Relations Committee will give our proposal serious consideration, in spite of the State Department's adverse recommendation.

In this connection, the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, in a column carried nationally yesterday, wrote in strong support of the Freedom Academy bill. I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Drummond be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 10, 1962]
How OUR COLUMNISTS SEE THE WORLD
ROSCOE DRUMMOND: PRAISE AND REBUFF

WASHINGTON.—The bipartisan Senate sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill have received some bad news—and a little good news—from the State Department.

The bad news is that the State Department does not want Congress to pass the bill creating a Freedom Academy which would do independent research on methods of waging the cold war and would provide special training for people, inside and outside the Government, to conduct the non-military side of the conflict more effectively.

Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, in a 3-page, 1,200-word letter suffocates the Freedom Academy idea with praise for its purposes and with a "no" in every paragraph, saying in effect: "Hands off, we're doing just fine."

On the other hand, the State Department, worried by the public support which the Freedom Academy is winning and apparently in an effort to blunt the case for it, announces that it is preparing to add a 5-week course in cold war techniques to the regular curriculum of the Foreign Service Institute.

I call this negative good news. It is good because by it the State Department admits the need for doing more to provide specialized cold war training.

It is negative because it shows that the Department is doing nothing adequate to provide this training. A 5-week course thrown together by an improvised faculty for a few Government officials is like sending the Marines to Guadalcanal after preparing them for a game of table tennis.

Thus, the State Department concedes that what the Freedom Academy would do is needed and moves to meet that need inadequately—woefully inadequately.

Perhaps it is understandable that the State Department should resist the Freedom Acad-

emy proposal. Every arm of the Government is jealous over its traditional prerogatives. There is a built-in bureaucratic resistance to anything that might upset the status quo—or even appear to do so.

Dutton's letter shows that the State Department is extremely sensitive over its jurisdictional authority as the President's sole agent in foreign affairs. I think it is overly sensitive and that Dutton's rebuff to the sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill rests on a misreading and a misunderstanding of the project.

Fragments of the problem are being dealt with by research specialists today. The need is to draw together under one roof the most qualified experts to undertake coordinated and sustained research to provide, not a cursory course for a few weeks, but a complete, specialized, and thorough training.

The Freedom Academy would not be operational, would not undercut the State Department. The service academies—the Army, Navy, Air Force, and National War College—all undertake continuous studies of military strategy. This research is available to the services; it produces new ideas and breaks new ground, but the service academies do not undercut the Pentagon or take operational responsibility from the Chiefs of Staff.

The proposed Freedom Academy would not dilute or impair the authority of the State Department any more than the Naval Academy dilutes or impairs the authority of the Navy. It would strengthen the State Department by nourishing the insight and the expertise of all in Government dealing with the cold war.

I should think that Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas and Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, the respective chairmen of the Senate and House committees to which the Freedom Academy bill has been assigned, would not accept the State Department's negative attitude.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate tomorrow, Tuesday, June 12, 1962.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS: IMBALANCE INCREASES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the latest statistics released by the Defense Department show that military prime contracts awarded to New York State in the first 3 months of 1962, that is, January through March, amount to \$670 million or 9.7 percent of the total. This is a decline from the previous quarter, October through December 1961, when New York State received 11.7 percent of the total. It is also a decline over the comparable January through March period of 1961 when New York received 10.6 percent of the total.

Mr. President, while New York's share declines, the dollar value of defense contracts going to California increases with each quarter. For the period January through March 1962, California received

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 11

24.6 percent as compared to 24 percent for the last quarter of 1961.

Mr. President, this imbalance is a serious one, not only from the point of view of New Yorkers who continue to pay nearly 20 percent of the Nation's taxes, but also to thoughtful citizens throughout the country who do not want to see defense work dangerously concentrated in one small area. Let me make this clear. I am not saying that New York should have work which they are not capable or willing to perform at the lowest possible cost. What I am saying is that more of an effort must be made to prevent defense work from becoming the particular preserve of one part of the country. Considerably greater efforts must be waged throughout the Defense Department to make use of capable firms which may happen to be located east of the Rockies.

Mr. President, just last week I received a letter from a small business in New York State which was anxious to get defense work. The president of the firm, which is located in Ithaca, New York, informed me that he had asked for a copy of the full specifications necessary for a certain item from the procurement office in California. He informs me that he was told that drawings and specifications could not be sent as the present supply was exhausted, but that he could travel to California if he wished to inspect the copies there.

Mr. President, section 2305, title 10 of the United States Code, provides that specifications and attachments must be "accessible to all competent and reliable bidders." Where this is not the case, the invitation is invalid, and no award may be made. I do not personally consider specifications available in California as "accessible" to a New York small business. If it is necessary to amend the procurement regulations in order to insure that specifications will be sent directly to any firm that is interested, then I intend to prepare, introduce, and fight for such an amendment to insure simple justice to small business people throughout the United States.

Mr. President, it is perhaps merely a coincidence that this matter came to my attention the very week that figures were released showing California's increasing preponderance of defense work at the expense of New York. Nevertheless, it reveals very strongly the need for increased effort by west coast agencies to provide full service and assistance to firms no matter where they are located. In fact, additional service in the nature of providing for complete information would not be amiss for firms located at such a great distance.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am having legislation drafted to insure that information is made available to all firms which request it on any formally advertised bid from the Defense Department. I am very seriously disturbed over the present situation and over the treatment which apparently is accorded to New York firms in certain instances, and I intend to follow up this matter with vigor and determination to enlist the support of all my colleagues whose States may also be the victims of similar neglect by procurement agencies.

OMAHA OFFICE OF THE PARK SERVICE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, earlier this year discussions occurred regarding a proposal to move the regional office of the National Park Service from Omaha, Nebr., to Cheyenne, Wyo.

This subject was gone into somewhat in the interrogation of Secretary Udall when he appeared before the House Appropriations Committee. A factual statement and other testimony is contained in the record of those hearings.

There was opposition to the move expressed not only by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, but also by Representative BEN JENSEN, of Iowa.

The report of the House committee on H.R. 10802 for Interior Department appropriations reads in part in this regard:

The committee does not believe that the proposed move of the regional office of the National Park Service from Omaha, Nebr., to Cheyenne, Wyo., is warranted, and has disapproved the use of any funds for this purpose.

No inquiry into this subject was made during the course of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee hearings on this bill. My further information is that no expression of interest was indicated on this point until the executive meeting of that subcommittee. Upon markup of the subcommittee there was inserted the following language:

The committee feels that the National Park Service should not be denied the use of funds contained in this bill to transfer its region II headquarters from Omaha, Nebr., to Cheyenne, Wyo., if after the Secretary of the Interior's promised restudy is completed, the advisability of the transfer is confirmed.

The language of the Senate subcommittee is in direct conflict to that contained in the House report. The Senator from Nebraska sought in Appropriations Committee markup session to amend the Senate language so as to conform with the House language. Failing in this, he submitted an amendment which in effect would have required the Secretary to report the result of his restudy of this subject to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate for their action. This second proposal was also rejected.

The testimony given in the House hearings showed that there would be a minimum of about \$200,000 spent during the course of the first year of such move over and above the present budget figures. It would involve an office having a little over 100 employees. It would involve moving Park offices presently located in very satisfactory and adequate Federal space to non-Federal space which would have to be rented. It was testified that some 20,000 square feet of space at approximately \$3 per square foot would be required. The office has been in Omaha, Nebr., for many years. The officials and employees of the National Park Service stationed there would undoubtedly find it difficult to re-move. This would result in accelerated retirement, on the part of several and perhaps many of them. Such acceleration is always an additional expense and a great

loss to Government service in view of the experience and the seasoning which such employees have attained in the Service involved.

The Secretary in his testimony before the House committee testified the basic consideration should be economy. There is no showing of any kind in the hearings that any economy would be achieved, either short range or long range.

Mr. President, if the National Park Service can expend within the course of this coming year an additional amount of about \$200,000 to move this office, it must mean that they have \$200,000 which they do not need. This amount is not large as sums around Congress go, but certainly it represents the tax dollars of many citizens which could be devoted to a much more useful purpose. On the basis that this move is unnecessary, it is submitted that the appropriation of this Department should be cut by those \$200,000 rather than to have them use that sum for an unnecessary move.

While the Senator from Nebraska agrees with the language and the conclusion of the House committee, he would be satisfied with language which would require the Secretary of Interior to report his findings to the Appropriations Committee of each house for its further action after he has made his showing on the point. Certainly if he were asking for an expenditure of a new item of \$200,000, we would like to have justification therefor. The amount is just as large whether it is for a new activity or for the expense of an unnecessary move of this kind.

During the hearings in the House, it was brought out that on previous occasions such a move had been proposed and discussed, so that the subject is not new. This is a fact, Mr. President, but in each previous instance after a thorough consideration by the Secretary and by the committees of the House and Senate, the proposal was rejected because there was no showing of any advantage by way of money savings, service or efficiency. In fact, the contrary was established.

It is my earnest hope that when conference on this bill is held that the language of the Senate Report will be made to conform to that of the House Report; or in the alternative that the language of the Senate Report be modified and amended so as to include the requirement that the Secretary report to the House and Senate committees the result of his restudy, for further action of those committees.

Mr. President, in order that this matter may be sent out in its more complete factual background, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from the testimony of the House, as contained on pages 46 to 48 of its hearings.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMAHA OFFICE OF THE PARK SERVICE

By the way, Mr. Secretary, I hope that you can tell us today that that proposal to move the regional Park Service office from Omaha, will not be consummated. I was greatly surprised when I heard that it was even con-